

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/628,011	TANG, KAI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kevin M Bernatz	1773	

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) Kevin M Bernatz.

(3) _____.

(2) Mr. G. Marlin Knight.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 21 April 2005

Time: PM

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

all

Prior art documents discussed:

Sato et al.

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner indicated that there appeared to be insufficient support for the amended language of "decoupled" as used in claims 1 - 18 and that, notwithstanding, the present rejections of record would still appear to read on claims 1 - 18 and 25 since one of ordinary skill, especially in view of applicants' as-filed specification, would appreciate that "decoupling" simply meant that the layers were exchange decoupled, i.e. separated from each other via a non-magnetic layer/material. Magnetostatic coupling/interactions, which is the basis for the antiferromagnetic coupling of the layers, would still read on the claimed embodiments. Since the prior art of record disclosed magnetic layers which were separated by non-magnetic layers, the Examiner noted that the embodiments represented by claims 1 - 18 and 25 were still anticipated by/obvious over the art of record. The Examiner and applicants agreed on some minor amendments to claim 19 to better clarify the layer order in order to place the application into condition for allowance.